

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
 09/845,990	09/845,990 04/30/2001		John L. Levenda	38190/209224	2934
826	7590	04/02/2004		EXAM	INER
ALSTON &	BIRD I	LLP		38190/209224	NIFER A
BANK OF A	MERICA	N PLAZA			
101 SOUTH	<b>TRYON</b>	STREET, SUITE	E 4000	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000			1771		

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/845,990	LEVENDA, JOHN L.
,	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jennifer A Boyd	1771
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 26 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice ) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a chiplaces the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advievent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	statutory period for reply originally set in	the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI	·	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		·
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5.⊠ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	<u> </u>
10. Other:	M	la Ruddock
	<b>Ula</b> Pri	C. Ruddock mary Examiner
S. Patent and Trademark Office	Tec	ch Center 1700

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's Arguments are not persuasive. The Examiner maintains all previously set forth rejections as detailed in paragraph 3 of the previous Office Action dated January 21, 2004. The Applicant's comments and arguments regarding the scope of the "consisting essentially of" language cannot take the place of evidence. It should be noted that the amendment dated October 1, 2003 simply states that the inclusion of a resin matrix would materially affect the basic and novel characteristics but did NOT state how. Additionally, the 37 CFR 1.132 Declaration is considered untimely.